

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 16-23, and 31-38 are pending. Claims 9-15, 24-29, and 39-46 were withdrawn from consideration. Claim 30 was canceled. Claims 1, 16, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara (6,560,282).

Tahara describes an MPEG encoder that receives "past encoding parameters" generated at a past encoding process. Encoding parameters used during multiple generations of encoding are stored in a decoding history to allow minimal picture change "even if encoding and decoding processes are carried out repeatedly by the transcoder" (Abstract, Figures 14-15). " Since conventional encoding and decoding processes based on the MPEG standard are not 100% reverse processed, the picture quality deteriorates each time encoding and decoding processes are carried out as is generally known. In such a case, encoding parameters such as the quantization scale, the motion vector and the prediction mode are not merely re-computed in the encoding process of the third generation. Instead, the encoding parameters such as the quantization scale, the motion vector and the prediction mode generated in the encoding process of the first generation are re-utilized... Thus, by re-utilizing the encoding parameters generated in the encoding process of the first generation, it is possible to lower the degree to which the picture quality deteriorates even if the encoding and decoding processes are carried out repeatedly"(Two paragraphs before the beginning of the Figure 16 description).

Consequently, Tahara describes a technique that decreases picture degradation associated with each encoding and decoding process.

By contrast, the independent claims recite "examining a source video stream to determine if a `sequence_display_extension` follows the most recent sequence header and sequence extension." The material the Examiner cited merely mentions the "`sequence_display_extension`" as an item in a history stream. However, the material the Examiner cited does not teach or suggest determining if the "`sequence_display_extension` follows the most recent sequence header and sequence extension"

Furthermore, the independent claims recite "confirming that `horizontal_size` is greater than `display_horizontal_size` or that `vertical_size` is greater than `display_vertical_size`." Although Tahara does not teach or suggest this element, the Examiner argues that it would be


obvious to one of skill in the art to create a reformatted stream by recognizing that the horizontal/vertical size is greater than the display horizontal/vertical size to meet the required bandwidth limitation. However, in order to make this argument, there must be some motivation in Tahara or elsewhere to combine Tahara with the idea to create a reformatted by recognizing the difference in sizes. It is respectfully submitted that Tahara does not provide such a motivation. Tahara emphasizes that its technique does not cause picture degradation. That is, repeated encoding and decoding will lead to substantially the same picture.

By contrast, the techniques of the present invention cause loss of information. By recognizing differences in horizontal and vertical sizes versus display sizes, the claims recite "reducing the content of said source stream to create a reformatted stream." Tahara does not reduce the content of said source stream and in fact at least maintains the size or even increases the size with an additional "history stream."

Consequently, it is believed that Tahara does not teach or suggest "determining if the sequence_display_extension follows the most recent sequence header and sequence extension," does not provide the motivation and in fact teaches away from determine "if horizontal_size is greater than display_horizontal_size," and does not "reduce the content of said source stream" and may in fact increase the content of said source stream.

In light of the above remarks relating to the independent claims, the remaining dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons noted above. Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Godfrey K. Kwan
Reg. No. 46,850

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(510) 843-6200